

Paper: “Étude de la reproduction de *Cardium costatum* (Linné, 1758) de la Zone Economique Exclusive de la Côte d’Ivoire”

Submitted: 14 May 2024

Accepted: 25 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: Jean Baptiste Aman

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p236](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p236)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Kouakou Barthélemy Koffi
École normale supérieure, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Le titre est à revoir sur le fond (car ne reflète pas le contenu du manuscrit) et la forme (nom commun de l'espèce ainsi que la famille)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Sur la partie méthodes et résultats, les auteurs doivent d'abord présenter clairement les méthodes qu'ils ont utilisés avant de présenter les résultats par la suite et non l'inverse. Les mots clés sont à revoir.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Oui il existe quelques fautes de grammaire et coquilles. Mais dans l'ensemble le manuscrit est bien rédigé et donc facile à lire.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

La méthodologie n'est pas clairement présentée. Par exemple les auteurs n'ont pas précisé le rythme de collecte des échantillons ainsi que les techniques de collectes.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Il existe quelques soucis de forme que les auteurs doivent corriger. Aussi, les auteurs doivent présenter les résultats dans la même séquence que la méthodologie

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

La conclusion est partielle. Les auteurs doivent la revoir en y ajoutant toutes les autres parties du travail.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Les références doivent être uniformisées.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Les auteurs doivent prendre tout leur temps pour intégrer toutes les observations portées sur le manuscrit.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear but but it contains a few grammatical and conjugation errors. There are also some aspects that need to be looked at much more carefully and precisely

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate but there are two references in the list of bibliographical references that are not cited in the body of the text

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Correct the few errors in grammar, conjugation and expression. Clarify the legends of certain graphs.
